BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
Minutes of August 16, 2016 Meeting
(revised 9-21-16)

Jim Bartl opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, August 16th 2016 with a motion to elect a temporary Chairman for the August meeting.

The motion made by Melanie Coyne seconded by Scott Shelton to elect John Taylor as the August meeting Chairman passed unanimously.

Present: Chad Askew, Tom Brasse, Melanie Coyne, Michael Stephenson, John Taylor, Ben Simpson, Hal Hester, Rob Belisle, Terry Knotts, Walter Kirkland, Rodney Kiser and Scott Shelton

Absent: Jonathan Bahr and Travis Haston

1. MINUTES APPROVED
Melanie Coyne asked for revision to the July 19th minutes, noting misspelling of Chad Askew's name on page 1. Tom Brasse made the motion to approve the minutes from the July 19th Building Development Commission Meeting; seconded by Rodney Kiser. The motion passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES & INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION ISSUES
Chad Askew shared he will be moving off the BDC due to other opportunities with AIA. He will remain on the board until a new AIA representative is approved by the BOCC.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES
No public attendee issues.

Patrick Granson introduced Walter Kirkland, the newest Public Representative serving the Building Development Commission. Mr. Kirkland has worked with the Department on various Task Force and Subcommittees.

4. GARTNER REPORT
Jim Bartl discussed the Gartner report introducing that Patrick Granson would lead this discussion. Patrick gave an overview of Gartner Phase 1 and Phase II recommendations and timeline in the commercial plan review. Per a request from the Department and LUESA Director, Patrick described the creation of a special BDC subcommittee to work with the Department on an issue raised by Gartner in their draft report to the County & City. Specifically, Gartner's recommendation states, in part; ***"Transition to have both the City and the County operate on a First-In, First-Out plan review process that is associated with realistic, predictable performance metrics to reduce inconsistencies and improve the plan review process."*** The Department believes the BDC should include at least AIA, PENC and ASLA reps, although the BDC may choose to add others. Other AIA and PENC members may be interested in participating as well. We believe this can be wrapped up in one 2-hour meeting. The Department has assembled a large body of information on the topic, which can be distributed to participants in advance to bring them up to speed in detail, including; OnSchedule history, OnSchedule performance data, process map, Gartner analysis, Ed Gagnon Focus Group input, industry benchmarking, and communication opportunities. The work can probably be limited to one session, with any follow up work handled electronically.
- Tom Brasse suggested one entry phone tree for City and County processes.
- Scott Shelton commented on added inspection items and accountability.
- Walter Kirkland noted this 20-year-old problem has improved a lot.
- Rob Belisle asked about consolidating authorities.
- Chad Askew asked for a brief on Gartner's position.
- Rob Belisle asked if this is about a difference in two review processes?
- Melanie Coyne asked if the reverse can happen; City going to OnSchedule.
- Terry Knotts asked Department to describe OnSchedule.
- Rob Belisle commented on the City of Charlotte queuing and FIFO.
- Chad Askew asked how other towns are effected.

- Tom Brasse asked if the City will be invited to participate in the sub-committee.
- Rob Belisle asked if Charlotte water was included in the study.
  Chad Askew asked if the subcommittee will provide feedback from Code Enforcement on FIFO and asked what impact will the redesign have on user interface.

Melanie Coyne made the motion to create the OnSchedule/FIFO Gartner Subcommittee, seconded by Chad Askew. The motion passed unanimously.

5. TECHNOLOGY UPDATE

Jim Bartl began this discussion stating that Michael Stephenson requested an update on the status of technology "post-freeze" enhancement. BDC and Department leadership agreed this should be a report to the entire BDC. Jim shared a quick review of how technology supports the org chart and P&I process. POSSE-Winchester/Outrider is the backbone of the system; and manages all permit issuance and inspection request/response as well as provides public records access. Includes customization for contractor pass rate incentives and auto-notification. TIP; a module that provides trade permits thru POSSE "as fast as you can type".

EPM-EPS provides electronic plan submittal and review capacity organized around the OnSchedule "just in time plan review" concept. This includes customization for AE pass rate incentives and customization for the plan review matrix, providing plan review with a minimum list of "topics to review", based on the particular project description. Meck-SI automates the special inspections requirements, covered by NCBC Section 1704. IVR manages less of our inspections and records requests than in years past, but 5-10% of contractors not totally web based and still depend on this.

Meck tech strategy and design is based on customer requests and has huge benefits to BDC & customers. Specifically, efficiencies in performance and staffing can be tracked to tech details. The Contractor pass rate in POSSE: pre-program at <55%, now >80%; workload saved = 52 inspectors. Current inspections line staff totals 115 inspectors. Staff/cost saving: 52 inspectors (hourly @ 55.3k) @93.8k/yr = $4.88M/year. AE pass rate in EPM-EPS: pre-program at <50%, now 73%; workload saved = 14 reviewers. Current OnSchedule & Mega plan review staff totals 31 plan reviewers, Staff/cost saving: 14 plan review (salaried @ 62k) @94.6k/yr = $1.324M/year. TIP manages 32%+ of the permit workload (29,000+/-)/yr; replacement requires 4 admins. Staff/cost saving: 4 admin support (hourly @ 40k) @64.4k/yr = $258k/year. Meck-SI: based on KC manual process and our volume, replaces 12 inspectors with 1 admin. Staff/cost saving: 11.5 inspectors (hourly @ 55.3k) @93.8k/yr = $1.078M/year. These customer programs save about 82 FTE's or $8-9M/year.

Sandra Broome-Edwards shared the tech enhancement schedule going forward describing big ticket projects from tech priorities proposed by BDC last January as follows:
  a) Holds management; *multi-phase with development of first part underway*
  b) Single Portal; *pending City-County agreement on tech strategy*
  c) Pathfinder; *in Discovery on ITS plans for FY18, awaiting planning and requirements gathering.*
  d) EPS archival/hosting project; *in process on the ITS plan, in the requirements gathering phase, scheduled for FY17 implementation*

Task Force related items included; a) additional RTAP refinements (including no-fault); a*waiting IT approval; b)* preconstruction meeting refinements; *Approved, pending; c)* streamlined project input requirements; *Approved, pending; d)* customer reminder on consistency policy after first review/inspection; *Awaiting IT approval*
  a) Enhanced management/notification on holds; *Approved, pending*
  b) Amendments to A/E best practice standards; *Awaiting IT approval*

c) Change customer notification default to opt-out, not opt-in; *Awaiting IT approval*
d) Assess system's auto-notification features; *Approved, pending*
- Melanie Stephenson asked what awaiting county IT approval means and if the Department will circulate the presentation to BDC members.
- Tom Brasse asked for an update on holds and the number of days we have been awaiting approval.
- Tom Brasse asked for an update on the City/County single portal.

6. CO RETENTION IN PERPETUITY & CODE GENERATION RECORD

David Gieser discussed the need to keep CO's forever vs. destroy after 6 years. The problem caused by BCC's switch to 6-year code change cycle. Department proposes changing policy to keep CO's forever so code official will be able to reference approved occupancy & construction type.

To help deal with past cases where owner claimed an occupancy change as original or approved, that didn't appear to fit site conditions; as well as with AE's claiming construction type that didn't seem to match existing condition. This will make the information readily available to owner's team and the Department.

Propose modifying AE Best Practice & code criteria retention to address BCC change to 6-year code cycle. The problem is that the BCC has approved over 200 changes (on 200 pages) to the 2012 NCBC. 30% are residential and 70% are commercial (including 5 admin code changes) and are posted to NC DOI's website and updated quarterly.

David went on to say that customers have the right to use mid-cycle code change as alternate method. So projects built under the 2012 NCBC will likely pick and choose BCC approved code changes to modify code requirements. There will be no future record beyond construction document set, creating unknowns when maintaining a building in compliance with the code under which it was construction. The proposed fix is voluntary. AE's will have a "code generation box" in EPS to enter code generation year, as well as the BCC mid-cycle approved code change they propose using. Most DOI code change quarterly posting indicate a meeting generation and item number; this will be used as the particular code change identifier. The AE will formally propose using this as an alternate method; the proposal must be accepted. The alternate method proposal will match up with the information in the "code generation box". Later, POSSE will transfer same "code generation box" from the permit documentation to the final CO, where it will be retained forever. If the alternate method proposal occurs later in the field, it will follow the same steps, except via an RTAP approach.

While submitting alternate method request is required, filling out the "code generation box" is voluntary for AE's. We do not plan to add staff to check or "gate" this; it is all triggered by the AE's formal request to use a mid-cycle code change via an alternate methods proposal. The rest is "best practice" criteria; both for the AE's and the Department. This was distributed to the Technical Advisory Board and they had no objections to the proposal.
- Melanie Coyne asked if this is for certificates of occupancy only and if so, will that be adequate. Melanie also inquired about funding.
- Scott Shelton shared he would advocate to keep a 15-20-year retention.

7. FY16 EOY NUMBERS

Jim Bartl discussed the FY16 end of year numbers described in the below presentation screenshots.

FY16 Workload and Performance

o Permits: total permits at 90,198, down 4.9% from FY15 (94,913)

o Inspections: total-265,520, up <.1% from FY15 (265,429)

o Inspection Response Time (IRT) % Complete in 24 Hours: 67.26%, *with goal range of 85-90*

o Inspection Pass Rate: pass rates at 80.34%, down slightly from FY15 rate of 81.58%

o OnSchedule Measures:
  o On Time-Early Rate: 90.33%
  o OnSch Pass Rates: 1st rev'w-73%, 2nd rev'w-86.75%
  o Total BEMP OnSchedule & Mega Plan Review Cycles: 14,625

o CTAC Measures: 1,347 1st reviews with 63.8% pass rate

CODE ENFORCEMENT '12' YEARS OF DATA

Item	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	Fy2011	Fy2012	Fy2013	Fy2014	Fy2015	Fy2016
Permits:												
-applied for	83,672	89,893	96,434	91,739	71,347	66,422	70,238	74,852	81,067	87,892	96,558	92,066
-issued	81,848	89,346	96,003	90,898	70,756	66,417	69,086	75,050	81,427	89,160	94,913	90,198
Construction value permitted	$3.2956B	$3.9753B	Note 7	Note 7	Note 7	Note 7	Note 7	Note 7	Note 7	Note 7	Note 7	Note 7
number of FTE's	197	227	223	240	242	176	130	142	165	191	220	245
annual budget	$18.68M	$21.231M	$21.907M	$25.62M	$24.810M	$17.551M	$13.22M	$14.243M	$17.774M	$21.50M	$24.22M	$27.379M
Inspections performed:	307,194	348,838	372,244	312,267	225,586	179,249	161,021	177,661	207,988	238,068	261,121	265,520
Inspection response time in days:												
-Bldg	1.08	1.053	1.051	1.06	1.038	1.05	1.078	1.16	1.3	1.28	1.289	1.33
-Elec	1.67	1.30	1.13	1.0092	1.0916	1.259	1.243	1.177	1.249	1.43	1.567	1.58
-Mech	1.34	1.1	1.055	1.0417	1.018	1.03	1.098	1.1825	1.312	1.55	1.38	1.47
-Plbg	1.12	1.05	1.043	1.023	1.012	1.03	1.063	1.14	1.164	1.36	1.278	1.46
-overall average	1.3	1.156	1.0717	1.0608	1.0475	1.12	1.146	1.1675	1.26	1.4	1.404	1.464
Inspection response time (IRT) in % completed 1st 24 hours: see note 8												
-Bldg	96.47%	97.69%	97.72%	97.73	98.53	98.23	95.96	92.86	89.77	85.78	78.6	76.6
-Elec	75.44%	83.80%	94.28%	95.6	95.84	89.52	88.69	91.47	91.2	79.08	57.56	58.93
-Mech	85.20%	95.75%	97.59%	98.58	99.3	98.38	95.66	91.58	90.23	74.38	69.86	68.5
-Plbg	94.99%	98%	98.22%	98.96	99.5	98.74	90.39	93.875	94.5	81.75	75.05	65.57
-overall average	88.30%	93.64%	96.87%	97.44%	97.94%	95.22%	93.31%	92.30%	91.05%	80.63% (8)	68.76%	67.26%
Inspection Pass Rate												
-Bldg	64.46%	66.70%	68.72%	75.10%	81.03	80.63	80.37	78.75	77.08	76.71	77.07	71.7
-Elec	73.19%	76.83%	76.06%	80.57%	85.16	87.66	86.87	84.38	83.11	81.06	78.22	79.32
-Mech	77.38%	83.47%	82.28%	83.48%	86.47	89.24	89.46	88.84	86.6	85.24	85.3	85.06
-Plbg	82.08%	84.58%	87.18%	88.33%	91.9	92.65	93.8	92.45	91.36	90.76	90.2	90.4
-overall average	72.83%	77.09% (4)	78.44%	81.10%	85.57%	86.99%	86.90%	85.36%	83.98%	82.26%	81.58%	80.34%
OnSchedule % on time/early	88.32%	63.86%(3)	94.1%(5)	92.10%	91.20%	94.32%	87.30%	92.30%	95.96%	93.47%	95.38%	90.33%
OnSchedule												
-% on time/early(for BEMP)	88.32%	93.86%(3a	94.1% (5)	92.10%	91.20%	94.32%	87.30%	92.3%	95.96%	93.5%	95.4%	90.33%
-1st review project count	2,411	2,460	1,994	1,955	1,740	1,474	1,998	2118	1932	2543	2592	2696
-total BEMP cycles rev'wd	9687 (3a)	12,780	12,060	10856c3a	7111 (3a)	5343	6563	7889	8979	11592	11,754	14,625
-1st rev'w BEMP pass rate	50.3%	54.5%	50.3%	45.5%	57.3%	59.8%	79.5%	77.5%	69.3%	66.8%	69.0%	73.0%
-2nd rev'w BEMP pass rate	87.5%	88.3%	85.0%	83.0%	87.3%	89.5%	93.3%	88.5%	81.0%	80.5%	84.0%	86.8%
OnSchedule booking lead times (all trades)												
-1-2 hour projects	12.4 (5a)	14.9	25.7	4.16	2	1.12	1.94	3.59	3.627	3.26	3.3	2.98
-3-4 hour projects	note 1a	note 1a	note 1a	14.08	4.16	2.6	3.43	4.95	4.736	4.66	4.1	4.42
-5-8 hour projects	23 (1a)	25.6 (1a)	35 (1a)	21.41	7.91	4	5.89	7.82	7.536	6.73	7.67	9.76
-Express Review (sm/lg)	20 (5a)	19	32	14/21.42	7.75/10.33	7.67.8	9.4/9.26	6.5/9	11.8/12.3	(8.4/10.75)	(10.6/14.6)	(8.4/15.4)
CTAC workloads and performance												
-1st review pass rate	59.00%	64.4%	61.5%	60.0%	70.00%	67.70%	65.00%	70.25%	71.00%	69.90%	68.65%	63.83%
-% of OnSch total rev'w load	25.0%	34.0%	44.1%	46.8%	43.0%	46.0%	45.8%	47.14%	48.00%	39.46%	39.25%	38.75%
-1st review count	848	1249	1606	1713	1355	1247	1278	1513	1518	1408	1311	1347
-turnaround time (av'g)	not avail'l	not avail'l	not avail'l	5.25	2.75	3.36	3.66	3.05	2.35	2.33	2.06	3.55

Corrected data chart.

FY16 Year End Numbers

FY16 Revenue:	Permit Revenue	$ 25,328,157.06
	Other Revenue	$ 3,782,170.92
	Total Revenue	**$ 29,110,327.98***

* totals: based on Navision reporting

FY16 Expenses:	Expenses	$ 24,756,894
	Encumbrances	$ 461,289
	Total Expenses	**$ 25,218,183**

Total in Special Fund Code Enforcement $ 19,746,802

Starting Balance in FY16: $15,354,549 + $4,392,253 = $19,746,802

8.   JULY DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

Permit Revenue

- July permit (only) rev - $2,302,941, compares to June permit (only) rev - $2,594,222
- Fy16 budget projected monthly permit rev; $23,310,691/12= $1,942,557;
  - so July is $360,383 above projection
- YTD permit rev = $25,328,157 is above projection ($23,438,284) by $1,889,873 or 8%.

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- Report temporarily suspended.

Permits Issued

	June	July	3 Month Trend
Residential	5971	5236	4953/5294/5971/5236
Commercial	2738	2593	2814/2590/2738/2593
Other (Fire/Zone)	272	270	338/334/272/270
Total	8981	8099	8105/8218/8981/8099

- Changes (June-July); Residential down 12.3%; commercial down 5.3%; total up 9.82%

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	June	July	Insp. Perf.	June	July	% Change
Bldg.	8450	7482	**Bldg.**	8463	7493	-11.5%
Elec.	9230	7933	**Elec.**	8372	7296	-12.85%
Mech.	4833	4217	**Mech.**	4509	3936	-12.7%
Plbg.	3974	3543	**Plbg.**	3472	3146	-9.4%
Total	26,847	23,175	**Total**	24,816	21,871	-11.87%

- Changes (June-July): requests down 13.7%; inspect performed down 11.87% (across board)
- Insp performed were 94.4% of insp requested

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time (new IRT report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	June	**July**	**June**	**July**	**June**	**July**	**June**	**July**
Bldg	85.39	83.7	97.48	96.9	99.51	99.6	1.17	1.20
Elec.	68.85	73.7	95.14	95.4	99.33	99.5	1.36	1.31
Mech.	78.23	77.0	95.67	95.5	98.98	99.5	1.28	1.28

Plbg.	77.92	87.5	96.2	98.3	99.38	99.8	1.26	1.14
Total	76.6	79.6	96.0	96.3	99.4	99.6	1.28	1.24

- Elec & Plbg up 5-10%; Bldg & Mech down <2%
- Per the BDC Performance Goal agreement (7/20/2010), the goal range is **85-90%; so the July average is currently 5.4% below goal range.**

Inspection Pass Rates for July, 2016:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 82.35% in July, compared to 82.7% in June

Bldg:	June – 77.37%	**Elec**:	June – 81.65%
	July – 76.68%		July – 82.59%
Mech:	June – 86.08%	**Plbg:**	June – 89.01%
	July – 84.97%		July – 88.33%

- Elec up 1%-; B/M/P all down ranging -.7% to -1.1%
- Overall average down .35% from last month, but well above the 75-80% goal range.

On Schedule and CTAC Numbers for July, 2016

CTAC:
- 122 first reviews, compared to 132 in June
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 83%
- CTAC was 38.85% of OnSch (*) first review volume; (122/122+192 = 314) = 38.85%
    *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

On Schedule:
- January, 15: 185 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.88% all trades, 93.5% on B/E/M/P only
- February, 15: 192 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.75% all trades, 96.5% on B/E/M/P only
- March, 15: 210 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95.1% all trades, 97.5% on B/E/M/P only
- April, 15: 240 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.5% all trades, 96.75% on B/E/M/P only
- May, 15: 238 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 94.75% on B/E/M/P only
- June, 15: 251 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.95% all trades, 95.82% on B/E/M/P only
- July, 15: 218 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.1% all trades, 90.75% on B/E/M/P only
- August, 15: 215 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.5% all trades, 93% on B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 15: 235 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–87.12% all trades, 92.5% on B/E/M/P only
- October, 15: 229 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.79% all trades, 91.62% on B/E/M/P only
- November, 15: 220 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–93% all trades, 92% on B/E/M/P only
- December, 15: 224 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–89.4% all trades, 90.75% on B/E/M/P only
- January, 16: 188 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–85.85% all trades, 84.64% on B/E/M/P only
- February, 16: 219 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–84.88% all trades, 82.75% on B/E/M/P only
- March, 16: 241 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–84% all trades, 85.25% on B/E/M/P only
- April, 16: 240 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–88.38% all trades, 91.25% on B/E/M/P only
- May, 16: 237 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–90.62% all trades, 94.5% on B/E/M/P only
- June, 16: 230 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.63% all trades, 95% on B/E/M/P only
- July, 16: 215 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.9% all trades, 93% on B/E/M/P only

<u>Booking Lead Times</u>
- o On Schedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on August 1, 2016, showed
  - o 1-2 hr projects; at 2 work days booking lead, but CMUD-3 and CFD-12 days
  - o 3-4 hr projects; at 2-4 work days lead, except CMUD-6, City Zoning-22 & CFD-15 days
  - o 5-8 hr projects; at 2-4 work days lead, but Elec-20, CMUD-16, City Zon'g-22, CFD-20 days
- o CTAC plan review turnaround time; BEMP at 4 work days, and all others at 1 day.
- o Express Rev'w booking lead time; 6 work days for small projects, 6 work days for large projects

9. Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

BDC Quarterly Bulletin
Draft completed based on the bullet points noted in the April BDC meeting. BDC Chair comments received. Final copy posted to website today (May 17) and also e-mailed to NotifyMe registrants.

Progress on RDS-CTAC Plan Review Audit
RDS audit effort completed with 4th meeting on August 5. CTAC audit effort starts on September 9. Tentatively plan to deliver a report in the October BDC meeting.

NC PE Board action on PE seal use in BIM-IPD
On August 1st, NC PE Board Counsel David Tuttle advised the Department in anticipation of the October 31, 2016 sun setting date for the BIM Guidelines, the Board at its July meeting extended the procedures that are in place through December 31, 2017.

The Guideline document on policy guidelines were adopted for BIM with a sunset date of October 31, 2016 for the same reason. Mr. Pond made a motion to extend the Signing and Sealing Building Imaging Modeling/ Integrated Project Delivery (BIM/IPD) Project Guidelines through <u>December, 2017</u>.

This means PE's working on BIM-IPD (or collaborative delivery) projects, will continue using the Board's Guidelines, adopted on 10/21/2015, on PE seal use in BIM-IPD.

10. Manager/CA/BDC Member Added Comments
- Jeff Vernon, Building Code Administrator reminded members the September Consistency Team meetings will be held separately.
- John Taylor, ABC Representative, suggested a mentor program for new BDC volunteers. Jim to discuss with Chair and Vice- Chair. Jim shared that we will hold a New Member Orientation once the AIA representative seat has been filled.

11. Adjournment
The August 16th meeting of the Building Development Commission adjourned at 4:57 p.m. The next meeting of the Building Development Commission is scheduled for Tuesday, September 20th 2016.